LINGUOPRAGMATICS ASPECT OF DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

Rakhmatova Odina Kadirjanovna,
Assistant, Fergana Polytechnic Institute, Uzbekistan, Fergana
o.raxmatova@ferpi.uz

Annotation

This article refers to the linguopragmatics saspects of discourse analysis as well as speech acts. The principles of linguopragmatic sanalysis of domestic dialogic discourse are determined by the relationship of discourse, dialogue and pragmatics. Everyday dialogue discourse has its own position in the discursive space of the artistic text and is characterized by certain structural elements (local and global) representing speech communication.

The linguopragmatics specificity of domestic dialogic discourse is determined by the unity of strategies and tactics of speakers and listeners involved in the creation and interpretation of a certain dialogic discourse.

Discursive factors determine the choice of lexical and stylistic language means in everyday dialogue discourse, which is characterized by a subjective type of actualization and an emotionally expressive component of communication. This updating is served by the discursive interaction of units and elements of various levels of the language (syntactic structures, word meanings, graphic expressive means) in the expression of the complex content of the text.

Keywords and expressions: speech communication, human communication, in a number of cases, language, a person in his activities.

Linguistic pragmatics is a discipline that learns language not "in itself and for itself," but as a means used by a person in his activities. It is customary to say about natural language that it is the most important means of human communication. However, with the exception of the so-called actual communication, i.e. communication for the sake of communication, we use language to solve some other problems: report an important event, encourage the addressee to take certain actions or stop them, express our feelings or assess someone's actions.

Finally, in a number of cases, the use of language is, if not the only, then the most basic component of an action that fundamentally changes social reality or individual fate (cf. abolition of serfdom, conclusion of a truce, conviction or award of a state prize). Therefore, learning language as an action tool is quite justified. It is from this angle of view that linguistic phenomena are considered within the framework of linguistic pragmatics.

The interdisciplinary direction studying discourse, as well as the corresponding section of linguistics, are called the same - discourse analysis or discourse studies. As a scientific direction itself, discursive analysis was formed only in recent decades (1970s of the 20th century). This happened against the background of the prevailing in linguistics for most of the 20th century. the opposite directed trend - 999 fights for the "purification" of language science from the study of speech. F. de Saussure believed that the true object of linguistics is the language system (as opposed to speech), N. Chomsky urged linguists to study linguistic "competence" and abstract themselves from issues of language use.

Recently, however, cognitive attitudes in language science are beginning to change and the opinion is gaining momentum, according to which no language phenomena can be adequately understood and described outside of their use, without taking into account their discursive aspects. Discursive analysis therefore becomes one of the central branches of linguistics.

Discourse analysis (discourse analysis) is a set of methods and techniques for interpreting various kinds of texts or statements as products of speech activity carried out in specific socio-political circumstances and cultural and historical conditions. AD as an independent scientific discipline, or at least an autonomous branch of scientific knowledge, originated in the 1960s in France as a result of the combination of linguistics, Marxism and psychoanalysis within the framework of general trends in the development of structuralist ideology.

Currently, A.D. is perceived as an interdisciplinary approach that took shape at the intersection of sociolinguistics and linguoculturology, but absorbed the techniques and methods of various sciences of the humanitarian profile: rhetoric, linguistics, philosophy, psychology, political science, sociology, etc. Therefore, it is quite acceptable to distinguish appropriate approaches as main research strategies carried out within the framework of AD, for example, psychological (cognitive, cultural-historical, etc.), linguistic (grammatical, textual, stylistic, etc.), semiotic (semantic, syntactic, pragmatic), philosophical (structuralist, post-structuralist, deconstructivist), logical (argumentative and analytical), informational and communicative, rhetorical, etc.

Among the predecessors of discursive analysis as a particular scientific discipline, at least two research traditions should be mentioned. First, it is a tradition of ethnolinguistic studies focused on the recording and analysis of oral texts of different languages; among the most famous representatives of this tradition is the school of American ethnolinguistics, founded by Franz Boas. Secondly, this is the Czech

linguistic school created by Vilem Matesius, which revived interest in concepts such as the topic and communicative organization of the text.

Discourse analysis - the study of the language used by members of some language community. In the course of such analysis, both the form of the language and its function are considered, both spoken speech and written texts, linguistic features of understanding various texts and types of oral speech are identified. Analysis of written texts may involve the study of the development of the topic and the connection (link) between sentences, whereas analysis of colloquial speech may focus both on these aspects and on the practices of step-by-step interaction, opening and closing sequences of social interactions, or narrative structure.

A single speech act is presented as a three-level entity. The speech act in relation to the language means used in its course acts as a locative act. The speech act in its relation to the goal manifested by the speakers and the conditions for its implementation acts as an illoculative act. Finally, in relation to the impact that the speech act had on the listener (audience), he acts as a perlocutive act. Let's explain this with a specific example. When we see on the front page of an opposition newspaper a statement typed in large print the full width of the sheet, INCREASE PROTEST PRESSURE ON THE AUTHORITIES, we, firstly, analyze it as a locative act, which in turn includes:

a) (in the case of written speech) the use of certain graphic symbols (letters, etc.) of a certain size and fat;

b) The use of words to increase, pressure, and power with their inherent linguistic meanings in this context and to combine them into a sentence according to the grammar rules of the language;

c) using these words to refer to certain objects and phenomena of reality - to the social group of potential readers of this body, to the governing bodies currently in this country and the possible actions of the former, expressing disagreement with the policies pursued by the latter and aimed at forcing them to adjust these policies.

Secondly, we analyze this statement as an illoculative act of conscription, aimed at putting forward a certain program of action and encouraging the audience to implement this program.

Thirdly, we can analyze this statement as a perlocutive act, and then we must investigate what effect it had on the audience: how many readers decided to actively participate in protests, and which, perhaps, did not understand at all what it was about.

Thus, the development of the linguistics of pragmatics led to the development of discursive analysis and discourse.

The actual linguistic uses of the term "discourse" are themselves very diverse, but in general, they are followed by attempts to clarify and develop traditional concepts of speech, text and dialogue.

Linguistic pragmatics, including a set of issues related to the talking subject, the addressee, their interaction in communication, the situation of communication.

References

1. Рахматова О.К., Рахимов А.Р. ПРАГМАЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКИЕ КОНЦЕПЦИИ ФЕНОМЕНА РЕЧЕВОГО ПОВЕДЕНИЯ И РЕЧЕВОГО ДИСКУРСА // Современные инновации. 2021. №2

2. Rakhmatova Odina PECULIARITIES OF DEIXIS AND ANAPHORA IN SPEECH DISCOURSE // Бюллетень науки и практики. 2021. №10.

3. Холматова Д.А., Рахматова О.К. ТЕОРЕТИЧЕСКИЕ ОСНОВЫ РАЗРАБОТКИ УЧЕБНЫХ ПОСОБИЙ // Вопросы науки и образования. 2021. №29 (154). URL:

4. Sultanova Sevara. On the definition of the terms "Variology", "Variation", "Variability". ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal, p 2307-2310. 2021

5. Muhlisaxon Kurbanova, Sevara Sultanova. THE ROLE OF NEOLOGISMS IN THE LANGUAGE OF MODERN MEDIA. CURRENT RESEARCH JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGICAL SCIENCES (2767-3758) p 80-83

6. Рахматова О. К., Рахимов А. Р. ПРАГМАЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКИЕ КОНЦЕПЦИИ ФЕНОМЕНА РЕЧЕВОГО ПОВЕДЕНИЯ И РЕЧЕВОГО ДИСКУРСА //Подписано в печать: 19.11. 2021 Дата выхода в свет: 22.11. 2021 Формат 70х100/16. – 2021.

7. Холматова Д. А., Рахматова О. К. ТЕОРЕТИЧЕСКИЕ ОСНОВЫ РАЗРАБОТКИ УЧЕБНЫХ ПОСОБИЙ //Вопросы науки и образования. – С. 30.

8. Kadirjanovna R. O. Pragmalinguistic Concepts of the Phenomenon of Speech Behavior and Speech Discourse //International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding. – 2021. – Т. 8. – №. 5. – С. 495-500.

9. Абдуллаева М. Х., Башарова Г. Г., Рахматова О. К. Преимущества индивидуального подхода в образовательном процессе //Проблемы современной науки и образования. – 2019. – №. 12-1 (145). – С. 88-90.

10. Холматова Д. А., Рахматова О. К., Косимова Д. Р. Этнографическая терминология и ее лингвистический анализ (на материалах русского и узбекского языков) //Вестник науки и образования. – 2019. – №. 19-3 (73). – С. 40-42.

11. Рахматова О. К., Косимова Д. Р. Актуальные проблемы преподавания русского языка в технических вузах //Проблемы современной науки и образования. – 2019. – №. 12-2 (145). – С. 127-129.

12. Холматова Д. А. ЯЗЫКОВАЯ КАРТИНА РОССИИ И УЗБЕКИСТАНА, ВЗАИМОДЕЙСТВИЕ ДВУХ КУЛЬТУР //Редакционная коллегия. – 2022. – С. 249.

13. Dilorom K. PECULIARITIES OF KINSHIP TERMINOLOGY IN TURKIC LANGUAGES //Universum: филология и искусствоведение. – 2021. – №. 9 (87). – С. 21-23.

14. Холматова Д. А. Теоретические аспекты изучения этнографии как научной дисциплины //Бюллетень науки и практики. – 2020. – Т. 6. – №. 8. – С. 312-316.

15. Холматова Д. А. ЛИТЕРАТУРНОЕ НАСЛЕДИЕ БАБУРА В ЭТНОГРАФИЧЕСКОМ КОНТЕКСТЕ //ИНТЕЛЛЕКТУАЛЬНОЕ НАСЛЕДИЕ ЗАХИРИДДИНА МУХАММАДА. – 2020. – С. 584.